

Relative Clauses in Eastern Shina*

Peter Edwin Hook
University of Michigan

In a pair of papers written almost twenty years ago E. Keenan and B. Comrie reported on a cross-linguistic study of relative clauses in which they found that the relativizability of positions in relative clauses can be formulated as a hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977 and 1979):

- (1) subject > direct object > indirect object (>) oblique object > possessor > compared object

As later work on brain activation supports (Just et al. 1996), positions to the right on this hierarchy are progressively more difficult to relativize on and, consequently, more rarely encountered cross-linguistically. In general, if a language disallows relativization onto some position on the left of the hierarchy, say, indirect objects, then it also disallows relativization onto positions that are further to the right, say, possessors and objects of comparison.

Prenominal relativization strategies in general are less explicit than postnominal ones. This is because prenominal relatives commonly if not invariably involve the gapping, deletion, or absence in the relative clause of any token of the noun phrase shared with the matrix clause. Together with this gapped noun phrase also absent is the postposition or particle or case affix that indicates the relation of the referent of the gapped noun phrase to the action expressed by the verb in the relative clause. Consequently there is a much higher likelihood for ambiguity or indeterminacy in the interpretation of prenominal relative clauses than in the interpretation of their postnominal counterparts.

Two prenominal strategies can be elicited from Shina speakers: The more explicit one uses a form of the interrogative or indefinite pronoun (which in E. Shina are the same) to represent the shared noun phrase inside the relative clause:

- (2) [kesi: myei madat thaw] (Zu; kone gaw)¹
who.Erg my help did that where went
'(Where did the one [who helped me] go) ?' (1989 field notes)

In the other strategy the shared noun phrase is 'gapped' inside the relative clause which itself, with the addition of the suffix *-(e)k*, becomes a noun phrase in the matrix:

- (3) [(e); myei madat thaaw]ek) kone gaw
(gap) my help did-one where went
'Where did (the one [who helped me]) go?' (1989 field notes)

In situations where the case affix is zero the addition of *-(e)k* is optional [see also exx. (7), (11), (15), (18)]:

- (4) musu [(e); goZ-e hA] karar; listhaar-emis
I.Erg (gap) house-Obl is.Fsg knife(Fsg) hide-1FsgFut
'I'll hide (the knife [which is in the house]).' (History of Astor)

Since the first strategy is one in which less information is lost one might expect to find it used especially when speakers relativize onto less accessible positions. However, an examination of texts reveals that despite its greater explicitness the first strategy is never used in natural discourse, not even when use of the second strategy leads to the loss of so much information that interpretation outside of a situational context is impossible. The first strategy, evidently an artefact of the use of Urdu to elicit data, is a calque on the relative-correlative construction found in that language.

Examples from texts that illustrate the progressively less accessible points on the Noun Phrase Hierarchy follow:

¹The bracketing of example (2) assumes that neither clause in a relative-correlative construction is embedded in the other (see E. Keenan 1985:164ff). Since in E. Shina relative-correlative clauses do not appear in natural data, making such an assumption has no consequences for the discussion that follows.

I. Relativization on subjects:

- (5) (Zi [Sac-ii hAA-k] phat b-il-e
those stick-Ger are-ones loose become-Pst-3pl
'(The ones [*who* were stuck together] were released.'
(R&P² 48)

- (6) "(anu ashup-e koi-se paŋyo b.il.o-k)-are
this horse-Acc any-Erg mount became-one-Dat
kacank-ek inaan d-on."
so.much-one prize give-1plFut

"We shall give a prize to (the one [*whoever* can mount this horse])."
(Kesar 135)

II. Relativization on objects:

- (7) Zu-se dad-y-ere ([jol-ejia wyaw] bai) khal-eé daw
he-Erg old.woman-Dat sack-Loc put.3sg food take.out-CP gave
'Taking out (the food [*which* he had put in the sack]) he gave it
to the old woman.'
(Maamad Sher Ali)

- (8) ([tu-se khyUU hAAw]-ek) ([mu-su khyUU hAAUs]-ek)-ejo
you-Erg eating are-one I-Erg eating am-one-Abi
so hAU
good is
'(That [*which* you are eating]) is better than (that [*which* I am
eating]).'
(1994 field notes)

III. Relativization on indirect objects and dative possessors:

- (9) ([tu-se rupaaye daa]-k baat) kone hAU
you-Erg rupees gave.2sg-one boy where is
'Where is (the boy [*to whom* you gave money])?' (1994 notes)

²R & P" refers to a line in the story of the queen and the bald man (*roni gaa pharaao*). A number preceded by "Kesar" refers to a line in the story of Kesar of Layu (see Hook 1996). Both were narrated to me in Shardu in October 1989 by Mr. Nasir Hussain. "Proverb", "Maamad Sher Ali", "Dodusher Gany", and "History of Astor" are unpublished materials collected by Nasir Hussain and transcribed by me in 1994.

- (10) ([shakal nush]-ek)-ere akal nush
beauty is.not-one-Dat wit is.not

'(The one [*who* has little beauty]) has little wit.' (Proverb 70)

IV. Relativization on oblique objects:

- (11) "[[baks-ijo PUU-e maar-aas] karaar] khal-e!"
box-Abi Pu-ilo-Acc kill-1MsgPst knife(Fsg) take.out-Imper
"'Take (the knife [*with which* I killed Pu-ilo]) out of the box."
(History of Astor 5.8)

- (12) ([Zo-i beey]-ek jery)-e gin-i wazh-oni razh-e
he self sits-one old.F-Acc take-CP come-Inf say-3plPst
'They told him to bring (the old woman [*with whom* he sits]).'
(R&P, line 48)

- (13) ([ikbal-ere samnan lad-u]-k dukaan) kone hAU?
Iqbal-Dat supplies(Fsg) got-1Msg-one store(Fsg) where is.Fsg
'Where's (the shop [*in which* Iqbal got supplies])?' (1994 notes)³

V. Relativization on possessors:

- (14) ([sAlyO nush]-ek)-i bat doyan thi
rations be.not-one-Erg hands washed they.say
'(The one [*who* has no rations]) washed his hands...'
(Proverb 72 [referring to a moocher preparing to eat])

- (15) ([nau pangave hAU] Ashup) gaa krino
nine stirrups is horse also rotted
'(The horse [*who* has nine stirrups]) also rotted.'
(Maamad Sher Ali 1994:33)

³Notice that the verb form *ladu* 'got' is masculine singular agreeing in gender and number with the dative noun phrase *ikbal-ere* 'to Iqbal'. Agreement with "dative subjects" is a peculiarity of the grammar of the verb *laj* 'get' and of some predicates of experience in Gulturi and other easterly dialects of Shina. See Hook 1990 and Hook 1996:172-4.

Notice that in examples (14) and (15) the shared noun phrase may be regarded as the 'logical' subject of the predicate of possession in the relative clause. That is, the possessor is part of the argument structure of that predicate. In the natural (unelicited) data the closest I have to an example in which the possessor noun phrase modifies some other noun phrase in the embedded clause is (16):

- (16) ([karkat-jiaa shas hAAw]-ek) tagaa-o
Karkat-Loc mother-in-law(Fsg) is.Msg-one lucky-Msg
'Lucky is (the one [whose mother-in-law is in Karkat]).'
(Proverb 70)

However, elicited examples of gapped possessors that function as modifiers of noun phrases appear below in exx (19) and (32-3).

VI. Relativization on indeterminate positions:

- (17) ([shU nush]-ek shafat)-ejaa gwake ne dyaa
dog be.not-one dish-Loc fight don't give
'Don't fight over (a dogdish [for which there is no dog])!'
(Proverb 85)
- (18) ([kuNo nush] aSe) (Proverb 128)
corpse be.not tears
'Tears [which no-one has died to cause]!' (=crocodile tears)

It is possible to elicit examples in which the loss of information is sufficient to render the result ambiguous, at least when presented out of context:

- (19) ([baal-i cori thaaw]-ek)-i ripOT ne daw
boy-Erg robbery did-one-Erg report not gave
'The person [from whom the boy stole] didn't report it.'
'The person [whose boy stole] didn't report it.' (1994 notes)

The ability to relativize on possessors is not so common in languages using pronominal relativization strategies. According to Comrie (MSS), for example, it is not possible in the Northeast Caucasian language Tsez in situations involving alienable possession:

- (20) *? g^w aj b-oxi-n b-ak'i-ru uzhi ujaj-xo
dog An-run-Ger An-GO-PstP boy cry-Pres
'The boy whose dog has run away is crying.'

In Marathi, however, relativization on possessors is commonly seen although my impression is that, like in E. Shina, its occurrence is more common in situations of inalienable possession⁴, as in (21):

- (21) ([mula as-l-el]-i loka) nehami dukhi dis-t-aal kaa?
kids be-Pst-PP-Npl people always unhappy look-Pres-3pl QM
'Do (people [who have children]) always look unhappy?'

There are two questions that I pursue in this exploratory study of the grammatical properties of the pronominal relative construction in the Gullari dialect of Eastern Shina: 1. Is the shared noun phrase invariably gapped? 2. Is the relative clause really a clause?

⁴ Even the expression of a kind of alienable possession via the pre-nominal strategy is not impossible in Marathi if some strandelable locative postposition (like *davaal* 'near') remains in the clause:

- (a) ([tikit dzaal n-as-l-el]-yaa loka-ni) hyaa raange-t
ticket near not-be-Pst-P-Obi people-Erg this queue-Loc
ubha raahu naye-t
standing stay shouldn't-pl

'(People [who don't have a ticket]) should not stand in this line.'

However, the pronominal strategy appears not to be open to the expression of alienable possession if a locative postposition used in expressions of possession is one that cannot be stranded:

- (b) *([tikit kaDe n-as-l-el]-yaa loka-ni) hyaa raange-t
ticket near not-be-Pst-P-Obi people-Erg this queue-Loc
ubha raahu naye-t
standing stay shouldn't-pl

'(People [who don't have a ticket]) should not stand in this line.'

Another way around the infelicity of using pronominals in the expression of alienable possession is to shift its temporary component onto some other locative relationship in the relative clause:

- (c) ([paase khishyaat n-as-l-el]-yaa loka-ni) phitim
money pocket.Loc not-be-Pst-P-Obi people-Erg film
paah-ay-jaa dzaa-u naye-t
see-Inf-Dat go-Inf shouldn't-pl
'(People [who don't have money in their pockets]) should not go to see movies.'

I am grateful to Madhav and Shubhangi Deshpande for checking some of these examples and suggesting others.

1. Is the shared noun phrase invariably gapped? Notice that the shared noun phrase in ex. (6) is present inside the relative clause:

- (6) "[anu ashup-e koi-se paNyo b.il.o]-are
this horse-Acc any-Erg mount became-one-Dat
kacaak-ek inaan d-on."
so.much-one prize give-1plFut
"We shall give a prize to (the one [whoever can mount this horse])."
(Kesar 135)

Examples of this kind appear to be limited to cases when the speaker does not presuppose the specific identity or even the existence of any referent matching the characterization spelled out in the relative clause:

- (22) [anu pezaar kes-ere gaa kar bilo]-k-esi naalaa kash th-ernus
this slipper who-Dat also fit became-one-with marriage do-1sgPr
'I'll marry (the one [whoever this slipper fits]).' (1994 notes)

It appears that there is another kind of relative clause in E. Shina in which the shared noun phrase is not gapped and [unlike in (6) and (22)] the specific identity or even existence of a referent that matches the characterization given in the relative clause is presupposed:

- (23) [se cai tu i se traaye-re phal.th-aa]-k mo bil.aas
that bird you Emp Erg window-Dat throw-2MsgPst-one I was
'I was the bird you tossed out the window.' (Dudusher Gaav)

At first examples like (23) may look like instances of prenominal relative clauses extraposed to the right of their head nouns (as occur in Basque: de Rijk 1972). If so (23) should be bracketed differently:

- (23') (se cai), ([tu i se traaye-re phal.th-aa]-k), mo bil.aas
'That bird, the one you tossed out the window, was me.'

However, this seems an unlikely analysis of the Shina: For one thing, the noun *cai* 'bird' is feminine, as is the speaker (*mo*), while the copula *bil.aas* 'was' is a masculine form, in indirect agreement with the subject of the embedded clause. Leaving *cai* inside the relative clause and having the copula agree with the relative clause's nominalized predicate *phal.thaa-k* allows an explanation for the masculine suffix in *bil.aas*. Secondly, the elicitation of other examples reveals that the leftmost noun phrases in them do not behave like the

subjects of matrix copulas. Rather they get whatever case is required by the predicate in the embedded clause:

- (24) ([lu-re son lej-ony]-ek) nush
you-Dat gold get-Inf-one not

'You are not about to get the gold!'⁵ (1994 fieldnotes)

- (25) ([musu anu krom thy-ony]-ek) nush
I.Erg this work do-Inf-one not

'I'm not about to do this job!' (1994 fieldnotes)

Should we conclude then that examples (23-25) are all instances of internally-headed relative clauses like those found in Diegueno⁶?

⁵ Even the expression of a kind of alienable possession via the pre-nominal strategy is not impossible in Marathi if some straddable locative postposition (like *dzaaval*, 'near') remains in the clause.

(a) ([likiT dzaaval n-as-l-el]-yaa lokaa-ni) hyaa raange-t
ticket near not-be-Pst-P-ObI people-Erg this queue-Loc
ubha raahu maye-t
standing stay shouldn't-pl

'(People [who don't have a ticket]) should not stand in this line.'

However, the prenominal strategy appears not to be open to the expression of alienable possession if a locative postposition used in expressions of possession is one that cannot be stranded:

(b) *([likiT kaDe n-as-l-el]-yaa lokaa-ni) hyaa raange-t
ticket near not-be-Pst-P-ObI people-Erg this queue-Loc
ubha raahu maye-t
standing stay shouldn't-pl

'(People [who don't have a ticket]) should not stand in this line.'

Another way around the infelicity of using prenominals in the expression of alienable possession is to shift its temporary component onto some other locative relationship in the relative clause:

(c) ([paise khishtyaat n-as-l-el]-yaa lokaa-ni) philiim
money pocket.Loc not-be-Pst-P-ObI people-Erg film
paah-aa-haa dzaa-u maye-t
see-Inf-Dat go-Inf shouldn't-pl
'(People [who don't have money in their pockets]) should not go to see movies.'

I am grateful to Madhuv and Shaubhagi Deshpande for checking some of these examples and suggesting others.

⁶ In their discussions of internally headed relative clauses the examples that Comrie (1989:145) and Keenan (1985:162) adduce that seem most similar to those of E. Shina are those from Diegueno.

Perhaps not: The meaning of examples like (24-5) is reported to involve an emphatic future (as reflected in their English translations) rather than the restriction on the domain of a noun phrase's referents that one would expect from a relative clause. Moreover, the putative relative clauses in some of them allow the occurrence of the topic particle *to*:

- (26) ([? mo to ([? aanaa-yo khar.the waapas waj-ony]-ek) nush
I.Nom Top here-from downward back descend-Inf-one not
'As for me, I'm not about to go back down from here!'
(Maamad Sher Ali)

Given the bar on the occurrence of noun phrases marked with topic particles in Japanese and Korean relative clauses (Kuno 1973:254, Na 1986), it would be surprising to find topic particles having scope over noun phrases inside Shina relative clauses.

On the other hand, to argue that the leftmost noun phrases are not part of the embedded clauses in exx (24-25) would require us to posit a rule of case attraction to account for the ergative in (24) and the dative in (25). Such a rule is required to handle other phenomena in the grammar of Shina⁷ and may well apply here, too.

- (a) Tñhay ʔəwa: ʔəwəw-pu-Ly ʔəjəwax
yesterday house see.Pst1sg-Def-Loc sing.Fut1sg
'I will sing in the house that I saw yesterday.'

The Diegueño "definitizer" -*pu-*, directly affixed to the finite form of the verb while itself taking case affixes may be compared to the E. Shina -(e)k-, while the presence of a full noun as token of the shared noun (in this instance ʔəwa: 'house') can be compared to *cai* 'bird' if *cai* is indeed inside the relative clause in (23).

⁷The evidence in support of attraction comes from constructions composed of a conjunctive participial (CP) form followed by a form of the stative verb *as* 'be' and is discussed in Hook (1996: 181). In (a) the pronoun *Zise* 'him' is the subject of the stative *asit-o* 'was-3sgM', but owes its accusative case to its being the direct object of *ban ih-* 'close up; shut in':

- (a) Zis-e kamaraa-k-ejaa ban ih-eé as-ih-o
him-Acc room-one-Loc closed make-CP be-Pst-M3sg
'He (Bubalaang) was closed up in a room.' (Kesar 45)

By making substitutions we can obtain evidence that the mascul-line singular form *asit-o* 'was' in (a) is not a default form but one that shows concord with the accusative 'subject' *Zise*. Replacing *Zise* with the corresponding accusative plural form *Zino* forces the verb *asit-* 'was' to take the plural suffix -*e* to accord with it:

- (b) Zin-o kamaraa-k-ejaa ban ih-eé as-ih-e
them-Acc room-one-Loc closed mak-CP be-Pst-M3pl
'They were closed up in a room.'

2. Is the relative clause really a clause? Given examples like (11) in which the embedded predicate form *maaras* '(I) killed' is fully specified for tense, person, number, and gender, one is apt to conclude that (leaving aside the gapping of the shared noun phrase) the E. Shina relative clause is a full clause:

- (11) "[baks-ijo pUl-e maar-aas] karaar] khal-ci!"
box-Ab1 Pu'ilo-Acc kill-1MsgPst knife(Fsg) take.out-Imper
'Take (the knife [with which I killed Pu'ilo]) out of the box.'
(History of Astor 5.8)

But active manipulation of such examples proves otherwise. Notice that in (27) the predicate form *khatu* 'emerged' is a masculine singular, in apparent agreement with the embedded subject *nom* 'name':

- (27) ([nom 'ne khat-u]-k)-i khei chiny-aw
name not emerged-Msg-one-ErgMsg bridge broke-3Msg
'(He [whose name had not emerged]) broke a bridge.'
(Proverb 129)

However, if the breaker of the bridge is not male or not singular, the masculine singular form *khatu* is not accepted. Rather, the past tense form of the intransitive predicate *khai-* 'emerge; climb' agrees in gender and number not with its subject *nom* 'name' but with the noun modified by the relative clause (exx from 1994 field notes):

- (28) ([nom 'ne khat-y]-ek)-o khei chiny-ei
name not emerged-Fsg-one-ErgFsg bridge broke-3Fsg
'(She [whose name had not emerged]) broke a bridge.'

Although there is a conjunctive participial form *ban rñe* 'having closed' in (a) and (b), it does not have the function of conjunction. Rather, it expresses a state. Compare (a) with (a'):

- (a') *ʔ (Kot-se) Zis-e kamaraa-k-ejaa ban thaw tato Zoi asit-o
someone-Erg him-Acc room-a-Loc shut did then he.Nom was
*ʔSomeone closed him up in a room and then he was.'

Since speakers are reluctant to accept (a'), and even when they do accept it, deny that it is a paraphrase of (a), we cannot regard the conjunctive participial form in (a) and (b) as having a conjunctive function. The constructions in (a) and (b) are monoclausal and to account for the accusative case in their pronouns we have to posit a rule of case attraction.

- (29) ([*nom* 'ne khat-el-k)-ojaa *khei* *chiny-e*
 name not emerged-Mpl-one-ErgPl bridge broke-3Mpl
 'They [*whose* names had not emerged]) broke a bridge.'

The morphological behavior of these examples is reminiscent of a class of compounds in Hindi-Urdu which contain intransitive past participles that agree not with their subjects but their head nouns:

- (30) (is [suhag-jal-ii]) *ke-sang* to ab *koi* na thaa
 this fortune(Msg)-burnt-Fsg with Top now anyone not was
 'There was no-one now with (this one [*whose* happiness had
 burnt up]).' (Sobati 1972:72)

To add a further layer of complexity animacy may also have a role to play. If the embedded subject is animate the concordant parts of the predicate may agree with either it or the head noun:

- (31) ([*laav-e* *baal* / *hAI*]-ek // *hAA*]-k / *cei*)
 many-Mpl children / is.Fsg-one // are.Mpl-one / woman
kone *hAI*? {1994 field notes}
 where is.Fsg

'Where is (the woman [*whose* children are many])?'

But in other instances involving animate subjects this choice is not possible. The embedded predicate must agree with the head noun and not with its subject (elicited data from 1994 field notes):

- (32) ([*mulaa* u*Cit-u*]-k)-i *ripoT* *daw*
 girl ran.away-*Msg*-one-Erg*Msg* report gave.3*Msg*
 'He [*whose* girl ran away]) made a report.'

- (33) ([*baal* u*Cit-y*]-ek)-o *ripoT* *dyei*
 boy ran.away-Fsg-one-ErgFsg report gave.3Fsg
 'She [*whose* boy ran away]) made a report.'

Perhaps a morphological explanation is possible in which the relative clause's predicate together with its suffix *-(e)k* and case affix would form a single word which must satisfy certain well-formedness conditions. One of these conditions would rule out discordant stacking of agreement affixes: i.e. *words that are simultaneously marked for two different genders and/or numbers. Since *exx* (27-9)

and (32-3) all have head nouns with ergative affixes that distinguish the number as well as (in the singular) the gender of their referents, these nouns cannot also agree with the subjects of their respective modifying clauses. (31), however, has an embedded predicate with only one slot for gender/number concord and may agree either with the subject of the relative clause or with the noun *cei* 'woman' that it modifies, without violating any such morphological constraint.

However plausible such a constraint may seem, it will probably have to be limited to situations in which the embedded subject is a third person. First person subjects allow the head noun to show two discordant number agreements [(34) is elicited data]:

- (34) ([*musu* cori *lh-aas*]-ek)-ojaa *ripoT* *ne* *dye*
 I.Erg robbery do-1*Msg*Pst-one-ErgPl report not gave.Mpl
 ' (The ones [*from whom* I stole]) did not report it.'

The morphological constraint, if it exists, appears to be interacting with hierarchies of animacy and person.

Whatever set of explanations proves to be optimal, we must conclude that what at first sight may appear to be fully fledged finite predicates in E. Shina relative clauses do not have the same properties that finite predicates in non-embedded clauses do. While the assignment of cases to a predicate's arguments is identical in both relative and independent clauses in Shina⁸, gender-number concord in relative clauses may be with the head noun rather than with the clausal subject. In this respect the relative clause of E. Shina is comparable with the relative participles found in Marathi, Gujarati, and other northern and western Indo-Aryan languages. However, it differs from relative participles in these and other Indo-Aryan languages in allowing agreement in person with the clausal subject.

⁸ Contrast the use of the genitive (rather than the nominative or the ergative) for the embedded subject in the prenominal construction in Urdu (a) and Kashmiri (ex (b)) is from *Reina* 1991:53]

(a) *jab* *raam-ne* *shaam-kaa* *kij-aa* *huan* *kaam* *dekha*n
 when Ram-Erg Shaam-Gen do-Pst*Msg* work(*msg*) saw
 (b) *yeli* *raam-an* *shaam-sinz* *ker-mis* *keem* *vich*
 when Ram-Erg Shaam-Gen do-Pst*Psg* work(*fsg*) saw
 'When Ram saw the work which Sham had done ...'

* The present version of this paper on the grammatical properties of an Indo-Aryan language spoken in Central Asia has been written to help celebrate the life and career of my colleague and friend, Professor Vitaly Shevoroshkin. An earlier incarnation was presented at the seventeenth meeting of the South Asian Languages Round-table (SALA-17), held at the University of Texas (Austin), 2-4 June 1995. The research on which it is based was conducted in Skardu, Northern Pakistan, during the fall of 1989 with financial support from the Smithsonian Institution as part of the project on folk cultures of Pakistan organized by Wilma Heston and William Hanaway of the University of Pennsylvania in affiliation with Lok Vitsa, Shakaparian, Islamabad, Pakistan; and during the spring of 1994 with financial support from the American Pakistan Research Organization (APRO) as part of the "Linkages Project" with the National Institute of Pakistan Studies (NIPS), Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan. For invaluable help in transcription I am indebted to Ruth L. Schmidt who visited Skardu in 1994. I am very grateful to Bernard Comrie for his perceptive comments on an earlier version of this, and I count it a great stroke of good fortune to have encountered Mr. Mohd. Nasir Hussain in the fall of 1989. Without him these pages could not have been written.

Transcription: Symbols used have the values normally found in descriptions of modern Indo-Aryan languages. I use doubling rather than macron or semi-colon to indicate length in vowels. While rising and falling tones exist in E. Shina, I did not attempt to record them in my transcription, except in gerunds. Cap forms of stops and fricatives / *T, Th, D, R, N, C, Ch, Z, S* / stand for retroflexed counterparts of sounds represented by non-caps. The digraph *sh* stands for palatal "esh"; while *ng* represents "engma". Nasal vowels are shown by the cap forms of the corresponding oral vowels. A following consonant tends to raise vowels; a preceding *Z*, to lower and centralize them. Intervocally the palatal affricate *j* is often realized as a fricative (*zh*). Abbreviations include:

Abl.....ablative	F.....feminine	N.....neuter
Acc.....accusative	Fut.....future	Obl.....obligue
An.....animal class	Ger.....gerund	Pr.....present
Caus.....causative	Imper.....imperative	Pstl.....past
Dat.....dative	Inf.....infinitive	P.....participle
Def.....definitizer	Loc.....locative	QM.....question marker
Erg.....ergative	M.....masculine	Top.....topic marker

References

- Comrie, Bernard.
1989 *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Univ. of Chicago Press.
MSS Relative clauses and related constructions in Tsez. Paper presented at NSL-9, Univ. of Chicago, 1995.
- Corbett, Greville G.
1991 *Gender*. Cambridge University Press.
- de Rijk, R.P.G.
1972 Relative clauses in Basque: a guided tour. In P. M. Peranteau, J. Levi, G. Phares, eds. *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*. Chicago Linguistics Society. Pp. 115-35.
- Hook, P.E.
1990 A Note on Expressions of Involuntary Experience in the Shina of Skardu. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 53:77-82.
1996 Kesar of Layul: A Central Asian Epic in the Shina of Gultari. In *Studies in the Popular Culture of Pakistan*. Edited by William Hanaway and Wilma Heston. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel. Pp. 121-183.
- Just, M.A., P. Carpenter, T. Keller, W. Eddy, K. Thulborn
1996 Brain Activation Modulated by Sentence Comprehension. In *Science* 274:114-6.
- Keenan, Edward L.
1985 Relative clauses. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 2. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 141-70.
- 1977 and Bernard Comrie Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
1979 Data on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy. *Language* 55:333-51.

- Kuno, S.
1973 *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press.
- Na, Y.
1986 *Syntactic and Semantic Interaction in Korean: Theme, Topic and Relative Clause*. Univ of Chicago PhD dissertation.
- Raina, Achla Misri
1991 *An S-Selectional Approach to Grammar: Some Issues in Kashmiri Syntax*. Unpublished PhD diss. Kanpur: Indian Institute of Technology.
- Sobau, Krishna
1972 *Daar se bichuRii (A Leaf Torn from the Branch)*, 2nd ed. Delhi: Rajkamal.

LUWIAN COLLECTIVE AND NON-COLLECTIVE NEUTRAL NOUNS IN -AR

Vyacheslav Vs. Ivanov
University of California at Los Angeles

Calvert Watkins was the first to establish the meaning of the Luwian substantive *wa-a-ar-ša* "water" (Watkins 1987, 1994:309-314; 1995:144-145). This discovery was linked to his new interpretation of the part of the Luwian ritual of Puriyanni KUB XXXV 54 III 12 ff. (the text of the beginning of the XIVth century, Starke 1985:55-71). In general one can accept his way to understand the text with a necessary change as far as the noun *ali* is concerned. As it was suggested by Meriggi (1957:215; cf. Laroche 1959:26-27; Carruba 1982a:47-48) the latter means "sea"; this supposition has been proved by the analysis of the use of the word in a group of the Luwian rituals connected to the birth of a child (Starke 1985:205, 210, 215; 1990). It fits very well in the interpretation of the ritual of Puriyanni as the charm of water and salt given on the base of the Hittite introduction by Laroche and accepted by Watkins (Laroche 1959:152; Watkins 1995:144, cf. already Meriggi 1957:203, 215; Carruba 1982a:47-48). In this conjunction as the source of water the river is mentioned whereas that of salt is the sea rock: *[w]a-a-ar-ša-a-ta [D-i] [na-na-a] am-ma-an [M]UN-ša-pa-a-a-ti-la-a-ti-u-wa-a] ni-ya-ti] u-pa-am-ma-an [w]a-a-ar-ša-a-ta zi-i-la [D-i] an-da [u]la-a-wa-i-ti MUN-ša-pa-a](-ia zi-la [a-a] li-i-u-wa-a-ni-ya-na-a] wa i-ti]* "This is the [water] (got) (=driven) from the river, and this is the [salt] brought from the sea rock]; the [water] will never go to [the river] and the salt will never go to the [sea] rock" (KUB XXXV 54 Rs. III17-21= II.1 according to the scheme of Starke 1985:55-59, 68-69; the last two sentences are repeated with small variations in a fragment KUB XXXV 47 2'-5' dated by the XIIIth century; Starke 1985:58-59, 71=III.2). The use of the case ending of the "animated neuter" -ša (Carruba 1982; 1992; van den Hout 1984; see already Bajun 1978) in the two last sentences of the text might have been motivated by the active function of the verb *i-* "to go" (cf. Ivanov 1981), with which the nouns *war-ša* "water", *MUN-ša* "salt" are connected as grammatical subjects. In two preceding sentences this animated function of the two nouns has been anticipated. That may explain the use of the same case endings in the constructions in which these substantives precede the forms of the nominative-accusative neuter of the mediopassive participles in -(a)man: *upa-mi-an* "brought" and (preserved only in its ending) *huana]mm-an* "driven, [icld", see on the other details of the syntax of the passage: Meriggi 1957:204; Carruba 1982a:47-48. The conclusion that at least in this text the case is that of the animated neuter rather than a quasi-ergative can be confirmed by the continuation where it is said that *[wa]a-ar-ša ... [ta](-la)-a-ta* (ib., Rs.III 25) "the water (is) pure" (Laroche 1959:152; literally: purity, cf. Carruba 1982:15; a shortened